

and difficult road to victory, but are necessary to win the future.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And, Mr. DELAHUNT, as we close here, I believe Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ is going to claim that next hour so we will continue. Democrats, we call for the redeployment, a number of Members and some Republicans, redeployment of U.S. troops. Due to the fact that Mr. RYAN talked so eloquently about section 1, Article I of the Constitution that says we have legislative powers, but it seems the Republican majority forgets about that. Thus far, the new Pentagon report shows that the situation is worse in Iraq. Every day we go now, the attacks are up to 700 attacks per week, 792 attacks. We also have U.S. troops and taxpayers continuing to pay a high price for the war in Iraq. We are approaching 2,700 U.S. troops dead, 20,000 wounded, and the U.S. taxpayers are paying more than \$300 billion on the war in Iraq alone.

That picture next to you, Mr. DELAHUNT, is very revealing, these two quote/unquote leaders are embracing that the U.S. has questions with.

□ 2300

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to join my 30-Something colleagues for this next hour to talk about the new direction for America that Democrats want to take this country in, and what we would implement were we to have the opportunity to take the majority after November 7 of this year.

We have been talking about the Republican leadership's security failures and the fact that while they talk real nice about how they are committed to homeland security and improving our security measures nationally, that is all it appears to be amounting to, is talk.

Let us walk through, my colleagues, what the reality is in terms of where Republicans have taken us on security. Let us look at the Iraq war. Right now, under the Bush administration's policy of "stay the course," our Republican colleagues have essentially been continuing to be a rubber stamp for a "stay the course" policy, even though that has strained our military, cost nearly 2,700 United States lives, and diverted attention and resources away from the real war on terror.

There has been article after article, Madam Speaker, that has come out that has clearly indicated, and the American people know this, that the war on terror is not going on in Iraq. It is going on in pockets throughout the world where, if we actually devoted our resources and our intelligence capabilities to the true war on terror and

shored up our borders and made sure they were not as porous as they are, then we would be able to feel more secure and I wouldn't get questions like I got yesterday all day when I participated in 9/11 commemoration events: Are we really safer?

People are really concerned. They are concerned in their hearts, Mr. DELAHUNT. They want to feel safer. They want the answer to that question to be yes, but they know that the answer is not yes. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are rolling out the same tired baloney, Mr. RYAN, about how they are going to be the ones that can be counted on for homeland security and protecting Americans in this hour of strife. Well, that is not the reality when we look at the facts.

Look at the Iraq war. We could not be in worse shape. Look at the war on terrorism and there isn't anyone that could examine the war on terrorism and say that we are winning right now; that we have been successful in our fight. We have not captured or killed Osama bin Laden. Terror groups and the number of global terror attacks are on the rise. Five years after 9/11 we have still failed to capture or kill bin Laden. And in a survey of America's top national security experts, 84 percent of them said that America is not winning the war on terror.

What we are calling for, Mr. DELAHUNT, is to finish the job in Afghanistan, which we should never have abandoned in the first place. The Taliban insurgency is on the rise. It is getting worse and worse there. Mr. DELAHUNT reviewed that in the last hour. Democrats would double the size of our special forces, increase our human intelligence capabilities, secure all loose nuclear materials by 2010, and implement our real security agenda, which those are all components of.

When it comes to homeland security, we would implement the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, unlike the Bush administration and this Republican Congress who have gotten D and F grades by the 9/11 Commission. We would implement their recommendations and fund them.

This is a really interesting fact, Mr. MEEK. If Democratic amendments, like that which we detailed in the last hour had been adopted, there would actually be 6,600 more Border Patrol agents, 14,000 more detention beds, and 2,700 more immigration enforcement agents along our borders than now exists.

We only check 6 percent of the containers that come through our ports. Most air cargo that goes in the belly of our passenger airplanes is still not being screened, and there is still not a unified terror watch list for screening airline passengers. What we are doing is having people remove their shoes before they go through a metal detector and now we make them throw away their Coke.

If we are resting the sum total of our national security on those two things,

then no wonder people ask the question like I got all day yesterday: Are we really safer? I wasn't able to answer that question yesterday the way I really wanted to be able to, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MEEK.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I think what is important here, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, is the fact that we know we have a real security plan. Members can log on to housedemocrats.gov and get this plan. It is there, Madam Speaker. Folks can't say that we don't have a plan or that we are not thinking about what we should be doing as it relates to terrorism. That is not the case.

We have two wars going on, one is against the war on terror and one is the war in Iraq. The war in Iraq is a miserable failure, as we look at it from a governance standpoint of this Congress and the leadership in the White House doing what they need to do.

Our troops and the commanders on the ground are doing the best they can with what they have to work with. But the bottom line is we didn't do diplomatically, and when I say we, the Republican majority and the White House, in making sure we had a true coalition before we went into Iraq. It is a coalition we paid for. The American taxpayer paid for whatever 25 troops that the country sent there, or the second largest force in Iraq, Madam Speaker, that is still there in the war in Iraq are contractors, that the U.S. taxpayers, where you get that \$300 billion from, Mr. DELAHUNT.

So as far as governance, it is not happening from our side. The war that Mr. Gingrich referenced is the war that had the connection with al Qaeda and the Taliban government. That was the response to 9/11.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But we left too early.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. But we left, and now we have commanders on the ground in Afghanistan saying, we are losing ground now. We need help now.

But guess what, Madam Speaker? War number two, that has nothing to do with the war on terror but now has become a war on terror, or we are trying to connect it, and the President spent almost more time trying to connect the reason why we went into Iran with 9/11. And that is not the case, and I think everybody knows it. The Taliban wasn't in Iraq. They weren't there, Madam Speaker. They have operatives there now as it relates to al-Qaeda. That is after we invaded.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They are training.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. They are training there and becoming stronger.

Mr. DELAHUNT. And they are going back.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. And they are going back and training. I am going to yield to you, Mr. DELAHUNT, but I know it is hard because this stuff is so much in the face of the American people, but we want to make sure that we break it down. But let me just make one more point, please. Let me just try to get this out and then I will happily yield, Mr. DELAHUNT.

The fact that we have two wars going on, and the Democratic leader of the Armed Services Committee that Mr. RYAN and I serve on, Mr. IKE SKELTON, he came to the floor, and I have his statement right here. It was a 5-minute speech he gave last week, and I heard him give this speech last week on the two wars. Right here on this floor, Mr. DELAHUNT, we were standing right over there, I said, Mr. SKELTON, can I have a copy of what you shared with the American people and the Members of this House? He gave it to me.

These are the three pages right here. Talks about the two wars, Madam Speaker. It talks about a war on terrorism, which we had Osama bin Laden pinned down, and then we went into this other war in Iraq that took troops away from Afghanistan, that stretched U.S. forces to the point to where they are now. It is kind of hard to keep up with the whole recruiting issue. We are almost giving away a Chevy truck for people to join the military right now. And it is very unfortunate because the U.S. taxpayers are being drained.

Now, when I said that it comes down to the failure, I am talking about the failure of the oversight and governance on this side of the ball, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RYAN, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We must do a better job. Now, how do we do that job?

Mr. RYAN speaks all the time about article one, section one of the U.S. Constitution. It is right here. It says the Congress, not the executive branch, has legislative powers. That means the House and the Senate. We oversee legislation. But that is not happening right now, and so that is the reason why we have the breakdown in government that we have right now, Madam Speaker. This is very simple.

We, the Democrats, are willing to put America in a new direction. Now, let us just talk about this new direction for a minute. It is not rocket science. It is just doing what the Constitution says. It is doing what the American people federalized us to do, is to represent them and not to be a rubber stamp for the White House.

□ 2310

We have borrowed more money than we have ever borrowed from foreign nations in the history of this country: \$1.05 trillion in 4 years versus \$1.10 trillion in 224 years. That is where it has gotten us.

Oil companies, record-breaking profits as far as the eye can see. The next numbers are going to come in even higher. There was a meeting in the White House in 2002, and look at how the profits have just taken off in the billions for U.S. oil companies. That's a lack of oversight by the Congress allowing the White House to have their way and to make sure that oil companies get what they want.

Here are the countries that own a part, a big part of the American apple pie. Japan comes in at a whopping \$682.8 billion, along with other coun-

tries. This is what happens when Article I, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution is not adhered to. This is not Republican and majority stuff. This is not anything when it comes down to Democrats versus Republicans. This comes down to if you are willing to suit up and put on a tie or a St. John's and you come onto the floor and represent the American people. He is all of our President. Goodness gracious, I am an American. President Bush is my President, period, dot. The election is over. This is not about an election; this is about governance, and it is not happening right now.

One thing that this Republican Congress does well, that is giving themselves pay raises. That is something that they do well. In 1998, a \$3,100 pay raise; zero to the American people as it relates to the minimum wage. It goes on and on all of the way to 2006. We have said on the Democratic side it is not going to happen because we are going to stand up on behalf of the American people.

Yes, there was a bill on the floor and we have talked about increasing the minimum wage. There is a lot of trickery in the bill, and it is not going to pass Congress, and it is not going to the President's desk.

I just want to say, I started with Article I, Section 1, which Mr. RYAN talks about all of the time. It has nothing to do with being Democrat or Republican. It comes down to if you are willing to be in the majority and say we are willing to legislate on behalf of the American people.

I have gone through a litany of things that have gone wrong because we haven't had balance in the three branches of government working in the way that they should. If you are an Independent or Republican or a Democrat or a Green Party or a young person, 17½ or going to be 18 by election day or whatever the case may be this November, you have to be concerned about the direction that the country is going into. We are saying on our side of the ball, the Democratic side of the ball, that we have the will and the desire to lead in the direction that we need to be led. We won't let people down, and we won't let it go out so far that it becomes too late.

Mr. DELAHUNT. We won't find ourselves in the same position that Chairman HYDE and Congressman KIRK now discover with their letter of last week asking the President to change the strategy when it comes to Afghanistan.

It is 5 years after 9/11, and they both said United States efforts in Afghanistan are failing. That is what the Republicans are saying 5 years after 9/11.

Now we are going to have a visit once more from presumably the President of Afghanistan and we are going to hear the same words and the same rhetoric that we have heard, but we know what the reality is, and that is that the safe harbor and the genesis of where the attacks were planned and fomented and those individuals who attacked the

United States train in Afghanistan, that our enemy there, the Taliban, are coming back.

We won't let that happen because we will be asking the questions all along. If it requires one hearing every week on Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran and what is happening, we will do it. As Mr. MEEK said, we will roll up our sleeves and get the job done because I think if anyone looks at this picture and reads the reports, the American people deserve some answers because the President of Iran and the Prime Minister of Iraq when asked at a joint press conference following their talks today about allegations that Iran was interfering in Iraq, the Prime Minister of Iraq said there is no obstacle in the way of implementing agreements between Iran and Iraq.

And the President of Iran responded by saying we consider Iraq's progress, independence and territorial integrity as our own. He also said that Iran hoped the United States will leave Iraq soon.

This is the President of Iran. He goes on to say that the triple strength and bilateral relationship Iran and Iraq as two brotherly neighbors will stand by each other and unwanted guests, and that's the U.S. Coalition, will leave the region, he said. The Prime Minister of Iraq described the talks as very constructive and called Iran a very important country, a good friend, and a brother.

Can somebody tell me what is happening? Are we seeing the emergence of an alliance that presumably would be detrimental to the interest of the United States?

What does the President say about this particular photo opportunity? Do you know, Mr. MEEK or Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ? What is the position of the administration? Maybe the Prime Minister of Iraq can serve as our interlocutor with Iran on their uranium enrichment program because we are not talking to the Iranians. We don't talk to them and they don't talk to us because we sided with Saddam Hussein in that war that lasted from 1980 to 1988.

Do you recognize this gentleman? That's Saddam Hussein? And you know who is shaking hands with him? That is Secretary Rumsfeld. That picture was taken in the early 1980s because Donald Rumsfeld, the current Secretary of Defense, he was the special envoy from the Reagan-Bush administration to Saddam Hussein.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. A picture speaks a thousand words.

Mr. DELAHUNT. But now we have a new picture. We have a picture of the President of Iran and the Prime Minister of Iraq. What have we done? Can anybody answer the question?

□ 2320

Mr. DELAHUNT. We know this, those questions will never get asked as long as the Republican Party is the majority party in Congress.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. DELAHUNT, I would like to talk about what we haven't done, and a little bit about what we have done. I can tell you last week, this is truly unbelievable.

I mean, I think that there would be unanimous agreement in this room, no matter what party you represent, that we have a couple of issues that are pressing in this country. I can't imagine anybody would disagree with that, whether it is the 46 million people that don't have access to health care, whether it is the fact that gas prices are hovering at or near or over \$3 a gallon, whether it is the fact that we haven't raised the minimum wage in 9 years. You know, there is a laundry list of problems.

Yet, last week, we spent our time, we spent 2 days here, Wednesday and Thursday. During that time, if you remember what did we do. We named some post offices, but we always name post offices, that is a ceremonial thing that we do as parts of our regular routines and rituals here at the high school we adopted some resolutions, expressed the House sentiment.

But that is what we usually do Tuesday, the first day we are here and sometimes extending into Wednesday. Wednesday and Thursday is when we get into the meat and substance of why we are here, we are addressing the Nation's problems.

Last week, we addressed the critical problem that I know I am stopped in the supermarket every day, the prevention of horse slaughtering. That is the only bill that we passed of any substance last week. We passed the American Horse Slaughter Prevention Act. I can tell you that I voted for it, because I believe that we should prevent the slaughter of horses.

But, when it comes to what should be at the top of the national agenda, I don't know. Somehow that doesn't come up in my town hall meetings. I can tell you that our priorities for last week included implementing the 9/11 Commission recommendations, raising the minimum wage, lowering prescription drug costs for seniors, increasing Pell grants for people who want to pursue higher education for students, rolling back the subsidies for big oil, which have been implemented by the Republican leadership in Congress, and their rubber stamped colleagues; restoring the PAYGO rules so that we aren't continuing with out-of-control spiraling deficits, so that we can make sure that we only spend what we take in, and comprehensive immigration reform.

That was on our agenda last week, and the Republican agenda was making sure that we prevent the slaughter of horses. I don't know, I think after November 7, I think most Americans are hopeful that we will move in a new direction. That when they get out of bed in the morning, they will not have to worry about whether there is a plan to make sure that it doesn't cost them more than \$50 to fill up their gas tank,

that the agenda that is addressed by the Congress of the United States doesn't include whether or not children will be reciting "under God" in the pledge.

I mean, most moms, with a young man or woman fighting in the war in Iraq, they are not worrying about whether their little ones are saying "under God" in the pledge. They are worrying about whether their baby is going to come back to them.

The father of four, before he leaves the house in the morning, do you think he is worried about whether or not we burn the flag that day somewhere in America, as objectionable as flag burning is, or do you think he is more likely to worry about whether he is going to be able to afford to fill up his gas tank with than \$50 coming out of his wallet. I mean, where are their priorities? How is that? How are those things the top of their agenda?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think whether you are talking about foreign policy, what's going on in the war, or what you stated their agenda was the last week, which has been pretty much the same for the past couple of years, just a bunch of stuff that really hasn't worked, and you could just look around to see the facts of the matter, but there is a general sense by this Congress, and I think this administration, of we don't have to fix these problems. They are somehow just going to fix themselves.

I found it very interesting, one of the bills I am most excited about when we get back in is Representative TANNER's bill and Representative CARDOZA's bill that says we are going to basically audit the government. We are going to find out whether there is fat, where there is wasted money, where there are programs that aren't working cut them and squeeze them and put that money into stuff that is working. But that takes initiative, as Mr. MEEK has said, it is about rolling up your sleeves and going to work and doing the hard work.

But I found it very interesting, as I was going through former Speaker Gingrich's basic proposals in the Wall Street Journal, I am sorry, and going through here, he makes a lot of comparisons to the Civil War. It is very well written and very insightful.

I want to just share with the House, Madam Speaker, a couple of things that Mr. Gingrich has said, which I think is the kind of attitude that he wanted to bring in 1994, and I think the kind of attitude that we want to bring in, and we will bring in when we take back the House of Representatives next year. He says, as he is going through the war, some suggestions for the President. He talks about several initiatives.

One he said, then, he, the President, should announce an aggressively honest review of what has not worked in the first 5 years of the war. Based upon the findings, he should initiate a sweeping transformation of the White House's national security apparatus.

The current, hopelessly slow and inefficient interagency system should be replaced by a new metrics based and ruthlessly disciplined integrated system of accountability with clear time-tables and clear responsibilities.

That is what the Democrats want to do. Let us provide some oversight to all this nonsense that has been going on, and then we have to listen time and time again, new show after new show, about how everything is going okay, we need to stay the course, and we have the former Speaker telling us, no, it is about an aggressive honest review of what has not worked.

There are numerous examples of that, and it is about time that the body that was created by Article I, Section 1 of the Constitution, provides the proper oversight. We are not talking about what's going on in local Rotary Club project. We are not talking about a local Kiwanis Club project to go create a river walk in a downtown. We are talking about almost 3,000 American soldiers being killed. We are talking about 20,000 of our soldiers being injured.

We are talking about thousands and thousands of Iraqis, many of them very innocent people, being killed, because we haven't figured out how we are going to win this war, and we have a Secretary of Defense that says he will fire the next person who asks for an exit strategy, or a post war plan. That is not leadership. I don't care what party you belong to.

This isn't about Democrats and Republicans. This is about fixing a major problem that will cripple the American economy, bust our budgets for the next generation.

Again, Mr. Gingrich says, because the threat of losing of millions of Americans lives is real, Congress should hold blunt no-holds barred oversight hearings on what is and is not working. Lives should be changed to shift from bureaucratic to entrepreneurial implementation throughout the national security and homeland security elements of government. That is exactly what Representative TANNER's bill will do. That is exactly what Representative CARDOZA's bill will do. Let us throw it all out on the table. Let us hold oversight hearings. Let us audit this government that is not working. This government was meant to work in an industrial society, and it is operating like it is 1950, which it would be fine if it was 1950, but it is 2006.

Everything has changed except for our national security offices and our homeland security offices. We created a 20th century bureaucracy with the Department of Homeland Security to battle a 21st century problem.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I just want to say it is outstanding what you pointed out, but I really do like what the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs do in my local area. I just want you to know that. We have a very strong Rotary in my area, Opelika Rotary, doing a very outstanding job.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Are you a member?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Yes, I am. I spoke at their dinner.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Pay your dues?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I am an honorary Rotarian.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Which means you don't have to pay your dues.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Moving right along.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. When I get back to my district, I am going to become a member of the Rotary Club, because I do have a pin.

Let me just say very quickly that this whole issue of the homeland security, and what we do and what they haven't done, when I say they, I am saying the Republican majority, as you know I am a member of the Homeland Security Committee. Last week we had a press conference.

□ 2330

We talked about our Real Security Plan, and we talked about the fact that Republican majority has shown that they are not ready to put forth this plan.

What is this plan? This plan embodies 100 percent of the recommendations that the 9/11 Commission called for. Wow. The government spent a lot of money and put together a bipartisan commission. They have hearings, they go throughout the country, they go to New York, they have hearings here in Washington, D.C., have former Members of Congress, have the National Security Advisor to the President come before them, have the President of these United States come before them, have Members of Congress and other security experts, CIA personnel, you name it, other clandestine organizations within the Federal Government. Some hearings are secure, some hearings are public. They put forth their report and we say, well, let's see. We will do this and we won't do that.

When you talk about national security, you can't skimp on the butter. You can't say, well, I am willing to wasteful spend as it relates to an unorganized response to Hurricane Katrina, or I am willing to send \$300-plus billion to Iraq with very little oversight. But when it comes down to the 9/11 Commission report, that is where the proof is in the pudding.

I am pretty sure every Member of Congress sent some sort of press release out talking about 9/11. Some Members went on further to justify the reason why things aren't the way they are supposed to be. Some went further and talked about how secure America is. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, the professionals are not saying here in Washington that we have done our job, we, the Republican majority.

I want to point a few things out. I am going to do the "Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ" here for a minute. Democrats are calling to make sure we go in a new direction as relates to homeland security. That is very simple. What

does this new direction call for? This new direction calls for the immediate implementation of all the 9/11 recommendations. That is not partisan, that is security, Mr. RYAN.

What else does it call for? It calls for 100 percent container screening of not only cargo containers that are on ships, but also cargo that is going into the belly of the plane. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ talked about that in the last hour.

We are taking our shoes off, hand your hand sanitizer over, you better drink that water before you go through the security area. What are you doing? Just before I got on the plane when I went to New York to be there on 9/11, I was getting on, and you know how they check you the secondary check before you go on the plane? "Oh, you have some chapstick here. You can't have this." "I am sorry. Take it, please." Meanwhile, looking out the window, I am looking at the containers going into the back of the plane going into Washington, D.C. I couldn't help but notice that.

What else are we calling for? We want to provide first responders with the training, equipment and technology they need, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, what they asked for, what the 9/11 Commission asked for, what Members of Congress asked for. But, still, bills to implement this are not able to make it to the floor because it is pushed back by the Republican majority.

Let's talk about what Democrats have done to lead on border security. The 9/11 Act called for 2000 new Border Patrol agents. I talked in the last hour about how we would add some 6,000-odd border protection officers in the amendments and attempts we made to try to increase that. We this year in 2006 called for 2,000 more Border Patrol officers, yet the President's budget only called for 210 new officers.

It goes back to what you were saying, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. The Republican majority is big on the talk, in the stump speech and having the press conference with security, homeland security, all this kind of stuff. But when it comes down to the printed word, when it comes down to the budget that is handed out from the White House and when it comes down to what this Republican majority does, it is 2,000, from what the 9/11 commission called for, and what we called for as House Democrats, versus the President's proposal, and you can look it up on line, that only asks for 210 agents.

Democrats fought for the funding on almost five different occasions. Again for the record, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, H.R. 1268, a motion to recommit, and 2,000, vote number 160, and that happened on 5/5/05. Also you look at House bill 2360 was blocked, it was an Obey amendment, vote number 174. That was on 5/17/05. It failed, 223 to 185 on a partisan vote. H.R. 1817, a motion to recommit, 2005, again vote number 188, again failed on partisan lines.

You start talking about on border security and closing the gaps. On nine separate occasions over the last 5 years, Democrats put forth motions here on this floor, because that is the only thing we can do. Being in the minority, we are not able to bring the bills to the floor, because the majority is blocking those bills from getting out of committee. And they are noted right here, and I am not going to go through that at this particular time, but all of this is on line, HouseDemocrats.gov, if anyone wants to go on and get this information.

Also when you start talking about aviation security, Democrats offered a motion to require air cargo to be screened within 3 years. The motion was rejected by Republicans, again 2005, vote number 188, 5/18/05.

Democrats have spoken repeatedly on the issue of transit security, making sure that we authorize including a \$2.8 billion initiative to improve transit security and a \$1 billion initiative to improve rail security. Substitute amendment defeated again.

So when you start look looking at the RECORD and what the RECORD says versus what is said here on the floor by the Republican majority and the rubber stamp majority, I wish the rubber stamp Republican majority would stop fighting us and start saying to the President, guess what, we no longer want to rubber stamp everything that you send here. I just wish the Republican majority would just leader up and say hey, Mr. President.

So you start reading the paper, could someone get me a newspaper, please, because I want to just have it as a prop, because as Americans start reading the paper, they are reading about how Republican Members of the House and the Senate, the President flies into town, they get on the plane and leave town. Some even get in their car and go. "I was on the other side of my district."

Well, let me tell you something, if the President of the United States is in my district, I think I would know. I think it would be some sort of news flash or some sort of e-mail that would come to me and say, you know, the President is coming in your district today, will be in an elementary school. Maybe you want to be there. He is the leader of the free world. Maybe you want to be there.

The reason why they are taking flights while the President is coming in the reason why they are finding something else to do while the President is in their town is the fact that they don't want to be caught in the same situation with the President of the United States because they have not stood up to the President and said no, you can't put us in a financial situation as far as the eye can see as it relates to deficits and foreign countries running the world.

You can't pick up the paper today not talking about a Republican running from the President of the United

States and don't want to be around when the President is around, or explaining why they are not there. That is some excuse.

I hope I never get to the situation where I have the President of the United States coming into my district and I have to explain that I am somewhere else while the President is there.

And the bottom line is this: People cannot face the music when it comes down to dealing with the policies of this administration, and better yet, you being in the position, there is only 535 of us, being in the position, as I come in for a landing, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, to be able to bring about change on behalf of the American people; to say this is not going to happen; to say I know you want to start a war in Iraq, but we still got this business over here with al Qaeda, who had everything to do with 9/11, who trained the individuals that carried out the 9/11 plot.

But, meanwhile, while we are over there looking for Osama bin Laden, and we have him cornered, I got this unfinished business, the President said, over here in Iraq, because I got a problem with this leader over here. We got to take him out.

But what about the after player? What is going to happen once you get to Baghdad? How are you going to bring stability? Who is going to be in the coalition? Calling up a couple of friends? I'll send 25 troops. I'll send 30 troops. You are not allowed to talk about it. Everything is secret.

We have the then sitting Attorney General comes to the U.S. Congress over on the Senate side and tells the Senate, you are either with us or you are with the terrorists.

□ 2340

What kind of mess is that? So when it comes down to Article I, Section 1, and if the American people want the kind of representation they need, I am not talking as a Democrat, even though we were given an hour by the Democratic leader and we are all members of the Democratic Caucus. This is America. I guarantee you if the shoe was on the other foot, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I cannot help but imagine the kind of chaos and protest and finger pointing and them and they and all of the things that will be said. Some of the stuff will have to be stricken from the RECORD because the Republican side will be carrying on about the Democrats. But they cannot say it. They can't do it. They cannot even kind of paint a picture because they have been in charge of the whole thing since it started. So if the American people want a new direction, if the American people want accountability, if the American people want a House and a Senate that will carry out article I, section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, and a lot of blood is on this constitution, but if they want that, then they will vote for a new direction in November.

I am done, ladies and gentlemen, with begging the Republican majority to stand up on behalf of the American people because I am looking at what the oil companies are getting. They are getting theirs. I am looking at what these contractors are getting, either it be Katrina or the war in Iraq. They are getting theirs. I am looking at the issue of health care and all of the people that are running to the bank with all of the dollars and all of the influence and all of the access into this Congress. They are getting theirs. Meanwhile we are sitting around here talking about the minimum wage and we can't even get a doggone bill passed off this floor to be able to provide the American people with a minimum wage. Meanwhile we are giving ourselves a nice fat pay raise every year, \$4,100 here, \$3,100 there. Oh, we have the money for that. But we don't have the money for the people who are punching in and punching out every day.

Madam Speaker, this has to come to an end and that is the reason why, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, that I believe there is a wind of change. It may not be outside the hall of this Chamber, but it is out there in America. It is in towns and it is in big cities and it is in emerging areas and it is in young people and older people that have decided in the past I am not going to participate, but I believe they are going to participate to save this country.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Speaking of the winds of change, you should have seen, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, the wind behind our flight that our two colleagues that represent the State of New Hampshire had when they immediately left the room during the immigration hearings that we held. The Judiciary Committee had those immigration hearings across the country. I attended one of them in New Hampshire, and it was one of those road shows where, again, the Republicans tried to represent a whole lot of rhetoric about what their record really is on border security and homeland security and there is no reality to back it up. So we brought reality, Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. MEEHAN and I, as members of the Judiciary Committee, went to that hearing, and we brought the record of our two colleagues from the State of New Hampshire and showed how ten different times while they were there in the room professing to their constituents that they were moderates on immigration reform and that they supported balance, we confronted their constituents with the reality of their record in a nice big lifesize form. And it was really interesting that the flight that they took out of the room following our putting that record up on the table and our asking, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and myself asking our good colleagues to say why they were saying one thing in the room at home when the reality of their record in Washington was completely different. And we had the facts, the third-party

validator to back it up, which is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And, of course, they had nothing to say other than, well, we supported the homeland security bill that had border security funding. And that is very nice but clearly that is inadequate. That is not doing the job. Otherwise our good friend Mr. SENSENBRENNER wouldn't be pursuing legislation to make 11 million people felons and really not addressing the problem either. But the reality of their record confronts their rhetoric over and over again.

Let us take a walk down memory lane, shall we? We have the rhetoric versus the reality on the war in Iraq and on the reality of their record on the War on Terror, which is different than the war in Iraq. Let us look at what was said way back before we actually went in and invaded Iraq. The rhetoric then was that Iraq had reconstituted its nuclear weapons program and posed an imminent threat to the United States. President Bush said in a speech in Cincinnati on October 8, 2002, that "America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof, the smoking gun, that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud. Saddam Hussein is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon."

Well, the reality was that Iraq did not have nuclear weapons. "Saddam Hussein ended the nuclear weapons program in 1991 following the Gulf War. ISG found no evidence to suggest concerted efforts to restart the program." And that was the Iraq Survey Group's final report, key findings, from October 6, 2004.

How about the rhetoric on Iraq's link to al Qaeda? Because the justification for war, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK, as you know, has evolved over time. When they could no longer use that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction or was developing a nuclear weapon, when that didn't work anymore because there was no proof and there were reports that said there was no proof that that was the case, they moved on to trying to link Iraq to al Qaeda. And this was what Secretary Rice said on Larry King Live on CNN on February 5, 2003. She said, "There is no question in my mind about the al Qaeda connection . . . And the most important thing for Americans and for the entire world to remember is that the potential marriage of weapons of mass destruction with terrorism is everyone's worst nightmare and you have, with Saddam Hussein, both a terrorist link and an insistence on having weapons of mass destruction which he could easily transfer at any time to one of his terrorist associations." That is what Secretary Rice said on February 5, 2003. Here was the reality: No evidence of operational relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. "After a lengthy investigation, the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States . . . reported finding

no evidence of a 'collaborative operational relationship' between the two or an Iraqi role in attacking the United States.' And that was the Washington Post report on October 25, 2004.

And last week we had the United States Senate Intelligence Committee release a report that also concluded there was absolutely no connection between Saddam Hussein and Iraq and al Qaeda. In fact, on the contrary. Saddam Hussein had intense animosity for Osama bin Laden and there was absolutely no connection.

Let us look at the prewar intelligence.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. If the gentlewoman would yield, so you are saying and it is fact that there is not anyone who believes that there was any connection between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda except for the two or three main leaders of this administration, period.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. And our rubber stamp Republican colleagues on other side of the aisle.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I do not know if they believe it. They are going along with it.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Right. Apparently, the only one who is still insisting that there was a link is the President and the rubber stamp colleagues that he has managed to collect here in this Chamber.

Here is more rhetoric: The Bush administration says that they didn't manipulate prewar intelligence. They argued that they did not try to fit the facts around what they intended to do in terms of their invasion in Iraq. So what they said, and this is Vice President CHENEY now that I am quoting, he said, "What is not legitimate, and what I will say again is dishonest and reprehensible, is the suggestion by some U.S. Senators that the President of the United States or any member of his administration purposely misled the American people on prewar intelligence." And Vice President CHENEY said that on November 21 of 2005.

Here is the reality: Former State Department official questioned the Bush administration's use of prewar intelligence. Lawrence Wilkerson, who was the former Chief of Staff to President Bush's first Secretary of State, Colin Powell, here is what he said: "After looking back at it, doing research over the last year or 2, and my time in the State Department, there is no doubt in my mind that certain members of the Bush administration did, in fact, politicize the intelligence." And he said that on CNN on March 17 of 2006.

Now, you know, I was raised to tell the truth, Mr. RYAN and Mr. MEEK. I was raised that you should back up commentary and back up commitment with action, and that seems to be totally absent. Our colleagues' ability on the other side of the aisle, particularly in the administration, seems completely absent when it comes to backing up words with action, when it comes to protecting our borders and

homeland security commitment. And for some reason they insist, and, Mr. MEEK, you have said this over and over, on the philosophy of maybe if we repeat it enough times, people will believe it. Maybe if we stamp our foot enough times, it will be true. Well, that does not work when my kids want to get me to do what they want, when they continually repeat what they want me to do over and over again and the answer is still no. And it does not work with the administration. It shouldn't work unless you are a Republican Member of Congress and you do whatever it is that the administration tells you to do.

□ 2350

Well, it is time for a new direction, and that is what we offer to the American people. We will actually back up our words with action.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I just want to reiterate this. The 9/11 Commission was not a partisan commission. That was not a Democratic commission. That was bipartisan, that was Lee Hamilton, one of the most distinguished Democratic Members of the United States Congress; the former Governor of New Jersey, a prominent Republican. A Republican in the Republican Party, very active and involved. That was a bipartisan commission said no evidence. No evidence. And then the new Senate Intelligence Committee, the Senate is controlled by Republicans, which means the Intelligence Committee is controlled by Republicans. This is a Republican committee, Mr. MEEK. So it is just, again, third-party validators, two committees, one bipartisan independent committee, another committee controlled by the Republican Party, both saying no evidence.

And then the Vice President gets on "Meet the Press" and says something different, and Secretary Rice is out talking about something that is just not even in the realm of reality. That is an insult to the American people. That is an insult to the 700,000 people in Ohio and the 1.4 million people that you represent in Florida. That is an insult. Don't insult the American people, Madam Speaker. Fix the problem. This should have been solved years ago figuring this stuff out, and it is kind of frustrating.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. RYAN, let me say this in closing, because I know the hour is coming to a close. And I guess the only thing that I could possibly say here is that the facts are there. We have the real security plan that is out there. We have a great debate that will take place tomorrow, even though it is already written in stone on what the resolution would say.

On this side, as we look at 9/11, reflection on 9/11, it is remembering those that lost their lives on 9/11. Those first responders, just including in those that lost their lives, but those first responders that survived 9/11, that live with 9/11 whether it be mentally,

physically, spiritually, or emotionally, what they have to continually have to go through with family members and Americans and thanking those that participate.

To go into this other area that the Republican majority, even after we have laid out all of this tonight about the 9/11 Commission report is still not fully implemented, we still have containers going into the belly of planes that are not being inspected, we only have 6 percent of containers that are going on the ships are inspected. We don't have interoperability, which you talked about earlier, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It still hasn't happened. U.S. cities don't have it. They didn't have it in New Orleans, and we still have a problem responding to even natural disasters that we know are coming almost double digit days if not 7 or 5 days before it hits. We still have those issues.

But on this side of the aisle, when you say the Democratic minority, we are saying we want to go with the memory of what took place, those individuals that died, those individuals that were hurt, to say we will never come back to this area again. The Republican majority, they want to address that, too, but at the same time want to push in some of this other stuff about how we are all secure and everything is better. That is not what this whole 9/11 resolution should be about. So I know that there will be a great debate on this floor, and I am going to go ahead and apologize to the American people because I know they are going to watch this debate and the are going to say, goodness, can't they be together on this, of all things? People have died on U.S. soil. Better yet, we have some that want to politicize it.

So I am going to tell you right now, I am not going to come down here, Madam Speaker, tomorrow and debate the majority on what I know that some of it is not true. The same thing comes up, this is Ground Hog Day all over again with the Iraq resolution. Every time something happens in Iraq: let's honor our troops and those that are fallen. Let's do it then. Then it comes down to all of this: we commend the President, and it goes on and on with all of these high embellished accomplishments which is not true. I am not going to come down here and debate that. So I am just going to say right now that this Congressman from Florida will not take part in the whole.

Yes, will I vote for the resolution honoring? Yes, I will. But I don't agree with the majority in using that opportunity to push a political agenda to say to the American people, see, the Congress agrees that we have done this, this, and that. That is not the issue.

What happens in the budget, we talk about border security, what the President has called for and what we called for, 215 or 216 new Border Patrol agents; we call for 2,000. That is where the proof is in the pudding. It is not a resolution; it is the action that it has taken and the lack thereof.

So, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, it has been a pleasure being with you for 2 hours tonight. I am ready to go home.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MEEK, as we close out and before we go to Mr. RYAN, I want to conclude by saying what a privilege it is to serve with the both of you and Mr. DELAHUNT and that the leader has given us this opportunity. I hope that 5 years from now when, after November 7th of this year, we are given an opportunity I am hopeful to run this institution, that on September 11th, 5 years hence, when we get asked the same question that I was asked yesterday, are we safer, that because we have implemented the 9/11 Commission recommendations and the other attempts that we have made to improve our homeland security, that we will be able to confidently answer that question, "yes."

And I think the saddest thing and the way I would conclude my remarks tonight, the saddest thing I reflected upon yesterday was that there was so much opportunity that we had after 9/11/2001. The country was so incredibly unified. Automobiles around this country on every highway had two American flags on either side of the windshield; you had universal unity. And this administration squandered that unity, and the road is littered with the missed opportunities. And it is just, really, sad isn't even a strong enough word.

Mr. RYAN, I yield to you so you can talk about the Web site.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. WWW.HouseDemocrats.gov/30-Something. All of our charts and visual aids will be available on this Web site. HouseDemocrats.gov/30-Something. And you can e-mail us there, too. Any comments, please feel free. Members who are watching or listening right now can have an opportunity to e-mail us and ask us any kind of questions. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. With that, Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Democratic leader for the opportunity to spend some time talking about the new direction for America. We yield back the balance of our time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. KELLER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCOTTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCCOTTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, September 13.

Mr. FORBES, for 5 minutes, September 13.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and September 13 and 14.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2041. An act to provide for the conveyance of a United States Fish and Wildlife Service administrative site to the city of Las Vegas; to the Committee on Resources.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3534. An act to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to provide for a YouthBuild program.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 13, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish & Wildlife & Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Establishment of a Non-essential Experimental Population of Northern Aplomado Falcons in New Mexico and Arizona (RIN: 1018-AI80) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9272. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — State Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plan [MS-016-FOR] received August 24, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9273. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the In-

terior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Topsoil Redistribution and Revegetation Success Standards (RIN: 1029-AC02) received August 31, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Mineral Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) and Oil-Spill Response Requirements for Facilities Located Seaward of the Coast Line — Change in Reference to Official Title (RIN: 1010-AD35) received August 10, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9275. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Service of Official Correspondence (RIN: 1010-AD22) received September 5, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9276. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 6 [Docket No. 060503118-6169-02; I.D. 042606E] (RIN: 0648-AT26) received August 4, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9277. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Services, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Cost Recovery Program for North Pacific Halibut, Sablefish, and Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Crab Individual Fishing Quota Programs [Docket No. 060424108-6204-02; I.D. 040706A] (RIN: 0648-AT43) received August 15, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9278. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Nantucket Lightship Scallop Access Area to Scallop Vessels [Docket No. 060314069-6069-01; I.D. 071806D] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9279. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Yellowfin Sole in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 060216045-6045-01; I.D. 071806A] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9280. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pelagic Shelf Rockfish in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 060216044-6044-01; I.D. 072006B] received August 3, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9281. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United